

The Review.

FOUNDED, EDITED, AND PUBLISHED BY ARTHUR PREUSS.

VOL. XI.

ST. LOUIS, MO., JUNE 9, 1904.

No. 23.

A RADICAL ERROR OF PRESENT-DAY EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY.



SOME time ago one of our contributors noted the fact that our National Commissioner of Education had come to the conclusion that the small boy likes to make a noise chiefly for the reason that, from the child's point of view, noise is an expression of power; and by making as much of it as possible, the boy likes to exhibit his power and importance in the world.

Our esteemed contemporary in far-away India, the *Bombay Catholic Examiner* (lv, 19), does not agree with this theory and makes it the occasion of a few well-reasoned remarks, which will surely interest our readers. Speaking of the "educational psychology" of which it is a product, the *Examiner* says:

The *raison d'être* of this so-called science is to analyse the mental and volitional processes of children, so as to adapt the methods of training and teaching to the habits and capabilities of the pupil—an admirable design, if only the analysis is correctly carried out. As far as we have thought over the question the mistake usually made is this—to analyse the boy's mind on the lines of the adult mind and on that alone. At first sight it might seem as if this were the only correct thing to do. But it is not, for the reasons now to be given.

The common practice is to divide humanity into babies, boys, and men, and then to regard 'boy' as if he had no baby about him and as if he were only an under-grown man. A more scientific division seems to us to be:—baby and man, regarding boyhood as a transition between the two, but not as a distinct psychological state. What is peculiar to the baby is the absence of reflex motives. All its actions are determined by animal instinct, sense of pleasure and pain, desire for whatever appeals to him as nice,

and shrinking from whatever repels him as nasty ; the sense of life breaking out into gambols and jubilant activity in the use of the limbs ; a certain instinct of destruction resembling that of the crow—a certain secretiveness or cunning in evading the interference of others ; an instinct of fear in the presence of large or unknown objects in motion ; an instinct of love for those who are near and familiar, etc.

In the adult man something is found which is wanting in the baby. It is the capacity of forming motives and acting on reflex ideas. But we must not suppose that an adult's life is all made up of reflex motives and ideas. A large part of adult life is identical with that of the baby's—natural impulses and instincts of pleasure and pain, love and fear, exuberance or depression of spirits—all spontaneously producing their consequences in action. In the adult it is true that reflex motive *can* always enter into combination with or into opposition to instinct, and that they *do* enter into many or most acts to some degree. But what we want to lay stress on is the fact that the properties belonging to us as babies are not lost or annihilated in later years. The baby instincts are there in us to our dying day ; only they are no longer so active and so universal. They are subdued, controlled, and in part suppressed, by that other power—reason and free will ; by acquired habits of self-restraint, driven into us at the end of the rod or by menaces and threats and penitential exercises at school ; or enforced by the demands of society and convention, self-interest or moral principle in later years.

The period which we call boyhood is that in which the transition takes place. The point of real change is just when reason awakes—roughly before the seventh year. To that moment the child was baby pure and simple. He differed in his condition of life in no way from the lamb which skips and gambols and cuts capers out of a sheer sense of feeling lively ; but—pace the National Commissioner of Education—we do not believe for a moment that the child's love of noise comes from a 'love of power,' or from 'a desire to exhibit his importance in the world.' You might just as reasonably say the same of a bleating lambkin or a blarting calf. The child loves noise simply for the pleasure of it—or rather, it does not love noise at all, but only the process of making it. Children do not love other people's noise. They do not enjoy sitting quiet and listening to another child squalling. What they love is to make a noise themselves, by shouting, romping and hitting things. And why do they love making noise ? In our view it is simply because they are full of animal spirits or pent-up energy, which seeks an outlet, and which it is a relief to let out. There is a pleasure in using faculties if it costs no

trouble ; and when the system is overflowing with superfluous life, noise is rather a relief than a trouble. It relieves the lungs and the muscles, and occupies the throat and the ears ; and if a sense of power enters in, it is in the way of enjoying the exercise of power, and not on such reflex adult-motives as that of 'exhibiting their importance in the world.' Children do not want to exhibit their importance—they don't grasp the meaning of 'importance.' What they want is simply to enjoy themselves.

And even when children begin to develop, and the gradual awakening of reason makes it possible for reflex motives to enter in, we do not believe that the love of music falls under the motive assigned. When boys want a romp, the thought of self-importance is, we think, the farthest removed from their minds. They rather wish if anything to be left alone, to enjoy the utterance of their buoyant spirits—perhaps as a relief after being boxed up in school—and are most pleased if nobody takes the least notice of them. They come from their romp with the simple feeling of being refreshed—of having let off steam—of having had 'a jolly time'; but never with the proud satisfaction of having 'exhibited their importance in the world.'

If boys want to exhibit their importance in the world it is generally in altogether different lines. But this is only when they have developed some way out of the pure baby-stage, and are sharing in the properties of the man. They feel the power contained in a large bag of marbles, plus the skill to add to them every game. They feel the power of lavish pocket-money. They feel the power of strong muscles and the art of boxing. These they will resort to in order to exhibit their importance in the world. But as for the baby-function of making a noise—pshaw, the idea is too absurd !".....

"Pedagogs should stick to grammar and analysis and syntax and prosody. The frame of mind which suits these subjects does not harmonize with the study of living psychology ; and this is why the pedagogic psychologist so woefully misses the mark. It looks as if pedagogs had never been boys themselves—otherwise the least reflection on their younger selves would cure them of their crooked analysis of boy-nature.".....

"If we want a sound psychology of boyhood we must take much more count of the 'baby' ingredient than is usually the case in studies of the subject. There is much more of the baby in all of us than we are inclined to suppose."



IS THE SINGLE TAX THEORY AN OPEN QUESTION?

VIII.

LAND OWNERSHIP AND REVELATION.

Henry George writes to Pope Leo XIII.: "Your Holiness intimates that the divine law gives its sanction to the private ownership of land, quoting from Deuteronomy, 'Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his house, nor his field, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything which is his.' [Deut. 5, 21.]

"If, as your Holiness conveys, this inclusion of the words, 'nor his field,' is to be taken as sanctioning private property in land as it exists to-day, then, but with far greater force, must the words, 'his man-servant, nor his maid-servant,' be taken to sanction chattel slavery; for it is evident from other provisions of the same code that these terms referred both to bondsmen for a term of years and to perpetual slaves. But the word 'field' involves the idea of use and improvements, to which the right of possession and ownership does attach without recognition of property in land itself. And that this reference to the 'field' is not a sanction of private property in land as it exists to-day is proved by the fact that the Mosaic code expressly denied such unqualified ownership in land, and with the declaration, 'the land also shall not be sold forever, because it is mine, and you are strangers and sojourners with me,' provided for its reversion every fiftieth year; thus, in a way adapted to the primitive conditions of the time, securing to all of the chosen people a foothold in the soil."

It is evidently of the greatest importance for us to know what Revelation teaches concerning private property in land, whether it approves of it or not. Leo XIII. maintains: "The same has, finally, been sanctioned by the authority of the divine law, which most severely forbids even coveting that which belongs to another. 'Thou shalt not covet, etc.'" Henry George contends that the text quoted does not sanction "private property in land as it exists to-day," viz., including, besides the right of use and the ownership of the improvements, also the ownership of the land itself; else, he says, the text would have to be taken also "to sanction chattel slavery."

The terms "slavery" and "chattel slavery" are with Mr. George a kind of bugbear designed to fill his readers with horror against individual land ownership. The second chapter of bk. vii. in *Progress and Poverty* bears the heading: "The enslavement of laborers the ultimate result of private property in land." It begins: "If chattel slavery is unjust, then private property in land is unjust." The first argument advanced by the Pope in favor of

private property in land (see THE REVIEW, vol. xi, p. 250) is thus answered by our economist: "If right reason does not make the slave the property of the slave hunter it does not make him the property of the slave buyer. Yet your reasoning as to private property in land would as well justify property in slaves. To show this it is only needful to change in your argument the word land to the word slave." And a little later he writes: "The essence of slavery is in empowering one man to obtain the labor of another without recompense. Private property in land does this as fully as chattel slavery."

This latter assertion is one of those exaggerations which by their very boldness betray themselves as arbitrary and untrue. For the rest we can not enter here upon the question of slavery. Suffice it to say that there is a kind of slavery which in itself is not morally wrong, and there was a time in which this kind of slavery was also legal. The Jews were allowed to have slaves, (Levit. 25, 44—46). The commandment of God, therefore, manifestly demanded the rights of those who lawfully possessed slaves to be respected, just as St. Paul ordered Christian slaves "to obey in all things (their) masters according to the flesh" (Col. 3, 22.)

But in any case, says Mr. George, the expression "*his field*" does not imply ownership in the soil itself, since "the word '*field*' involves the idea of use and improvements." The word "*field*" indeed involves the idea of use and improvements, but much more and above everything else, it signifies the *soil* itself. Only if you own the land or soil, you can call the field yours; one who has merely rented a farm, can not call it his. In the Henry George theory "the individual possessor of a particular piece or tract of land is in reality nothing more than a tenant of the State or the community," and the State or the community is in reality "the universal landlord." Hence the words "nor his field" of Deuteronomy can not be taken as denoting merely "possession" or usufruct in opposition to "property in land itself," but they denote real property or ownership in land, just as the words "nor his house," "nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything else which is his" signify real property or ownership.

As regards the declaration of the Mosaic law, "The land also shall not be sold for ever: because it is mine, and you are strangers and sojourners with me" (Levit. 25, 23), this means nothing but a prohibition of selling landed property.

An Israelite could lease his land or sell the usufruct up to the next "year of the jubilee," but he could never sell the property in land itself. The land in each case belonged always, not to the whole of "the chosen people," but to the particular family to which it had been given at the first distribution after the conquest of

Palestine. Whatever land had been "sold," i. e. leased, had to be returned every fiftieth year. "And thou shalt sanctify the fiftieth year, and shalt proclaim remission to all the inhabitants of thy land; for it is the year of the jubilee. Every man shall return to his possession, and every one shall go back to his former family. . . . In the year of the jubilee all shall return to their possessions. . . . For in that year all that is sold shall return to the owner and to the ancient possessor" (Levit. 25, 10; 13, 28.)

The landed property among the Israelites was not common, but private, though by special provision of the law inalienable and transferable only by inheritance. "Command the children of Israel and say to them: When you shall have passed over the Jordan, entering into the land of Chanaan, destroy all the inhabitants of that land. . . . And you shall divide it among you by lot. . . . To every one as the lot shall fall, so shall the inheritance be given. The possession shall be divided by the tribes and the families" (Num. 33, 51—54,) Special regulations were enacted concerning marriage, "lest the possessions of the children of Israel be mingled from tribe to tribe. . . . that the inheritance may remain in the families, and that the tribes be not mingled one with another, but remain so as they were separated by the Lord" (Deut. 36, 7—10.)

The Israelites were truly "the chosen people," the people of divine predilection, and God was in a particular sense their Lord and God. Of this He wished them to be always mindful; therefore He reminded them frequently that the land which they should possess was the land which was His own, which He had promised to their fathers, which He would give them, and that to each family, as it were, in particular, by a special disposition of His, viz., "by lot." A positive and explicit grant by God is certainly a lawful title of full and complete ownership. But we must remember that God grants His gifts differently than man. What God grants or gives to man, remains His as before, whilst what one man gives to another, does not remain his. God is and remains necessarily the Lord of all things, of the earth and all its treasures, as well as of man and all he has or acquires in any manner whatsoever. Nevertheless man really owns whatever he owns; but what he owns, is his own, not as against the Lord and Creator of all things, but "as against all the world."

One might perhaps say: from your explanation it follows that among the Israelites private property in land existed by the positive divine law, not merely by natural right. This may be conceded. But private property in land existed long before the time of the exodus of Israel from Egypt. In Genesis (ch. 23) we find a detailed account of a land sale. It is the transaction by which Abraham acquired by purchase from Ephron, the son of Seor,

"the field that before was Ephron's, wherein was the double cave, looking towards Mambre, both it and the cave, and all the trees thereof in all its limits round about it." In ch. 33 it is related that Jacob bought in the neighborhood of the city of Salem "that part of the field, in which he pitched his tents." "About five hundred years later, the same field is called the inherited possession of the descendants of Jacob, and is chosen for the burying-place of the Patriarch Joseph" (Cathrein, p. 59.) In Egypt "inheritable private ownership in land" can be traced back as far as the dynasty of the "Pyramid Kings," i. e., several centuries before Abraham, and in Babylonia and Assyria to the earliest periods of the respective nations" [Cathrein, pp. 64 sq.]

Now we must bear in mind that the Decalog as promulgated through Moses had the force of a "positive divine law" indeed only for the Jews, but that they had to observe this "divine law" not only towards the children of Israel, but towards all nations with whom they should come in contact later on. Undoubtedly the ten commandments were given them in order that they should faithfully observe them wherever they would be. Hence the commandments, "thou shalt not steal," "thou shalt not covet (thy neighbor's) house, nor his field, . . . nor anything that is his," bade them to respect their neighbor's life and property everywhere. Moreover, although the whole Mosaic law ceased with the introduction of the new law, the ten commandments, with the exception of some details evidently intended only for "the chosen people" as such, were renewed by Christ and form part of the new law which is to last to the end of time. Accordingly, what Leo XIII. maintains is perfectly true, viz., private property in land "has been sanctioned by the authority of the divine law." The doctrine, therefore, declaring individual land ownership to be morally wrong and unjust, is not only opposed to reason, but also to divine revelation.

After the passage quoted above from his Open Letter, Henry George continues as follows: "Nowhere in fact throughout the Scriptures can the slightest justification be found for the attaching to land of the same right of property that justly attaches to the things produced by labor. Everywhere is it treated as the free bounty of God, 'the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.'"

The audacity of this sweeping assertion is indeed amazing. The following texts need no comment. Our Lord said to St. Peter: "Every one that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands for my name's sake: shall receive an hundred-fold, and shall possess life everlasting." Matth. 19, 29. In the Acts we read of the first Christians:

"As many as were owners of lands or houses sold them, and brought the price of the things they sold, and laid it down before the feet of the Apostles.... And Joseph.... having land, sold it, and brought the price.... But a certain man named Ananias, with Saphira, his wife, sold a piece of land, and by fraud kept back part of the price of the land. But Peter said: Ananias, why hath Satan tempted thy heart, that thou shouldst.... by fraud keep part of the price of the land? Whilst it (the land) remained (unsold), did it not remain to thee? and after it was sold, was it (the price) not in thy power (at thy free disposal)? Why hast thou conceived this thing in thy heart?" [Acts 4, 34-37; 5, 1-4.]

In these passages private property in land is represented and declared as lawful, although divesting one's self of it for God's sake is described as an act of superior virtue. Hence the contrary doctrine has always been considered heretical.

(To be continued.)



THE ROMAN CATHOLIC MUTUAL PROTECTIVE SOCIETY OF IOWA

was organized in 1879 as a beneficial society, in which each survivor paid one dollar at the death of a member, the proceeds of such collection, less 10%, going to the beneficiary of the deceased member's certificate, with the restriction that the amount so paid must not exceed \$2,000 for full rate and \$1,000 for half rate members, who get but half the proceeds.

This rather simple method not proving satisfactory, about 1889 an attempt at reform was made by classifying the members according to age and introducing a graded scale of assessments, which should also provide for a sinking fund.

Even this new plan does not work smoothly, and another effort is to be made to place the concern on a basis equitable to all members and perfectly secure. The details are not yet decided.

In one sense this society is not so badly off as some others, since it does not promise any definite death benefit, but simply one-half or the full amount of one assessment call or collection, less 10%. So there really is not a definite amount promised. But it is also clear that members join under the impression that they secure death benefits of \$1,000 or \$2,000, as the case may be, and the fact remains that each member pays for the maximum benefit obtainable under his certificate, regardless of the chance that at the time of his death such certificate may receive any amount from 50 cents up to the figures named in the certificate.

Before venturing any opinion about this matter, the rates as

charged at present will be examined and compared with the actual net cost of insurance during life, on the basis of the American Table of Mortality and 4% interest, not including expenses.

If we are correctly informed, the society charges now three assessments a month, payable on the first, equal to twelve payments a year. Here follows the table on basis of a year's cost, compared with the annual net premium explained above.

AGE.	IOWA SOCIETY.	NET PREMIUM.	AGE.	IOWA SOCIETY.	NET PREMIUM.
20	\$10.80	\$12.67	35	\$16.20	\$18.84
21	"	12.94	36	"	19.46
22	"	13.24	37	"	20.12
23	"	13.55	38	"	20.82
24	"	13.87	39	"	21.57
25	12.60	14.21	40	18.00	22.35
26	"	14.57	41	"	23.19
27	"	14.95	42	"	24.08
28	"	15.35	43	"	25.03
29	"	15.77	44	"	26.04
30	14.40	16.21	45	19.80	27.12
31	"	16.68	46	"	28.27
32	"	17.18	47	21.60	29.50
33	"	17.70	48	23.40	30.81
34	"	18.25	49	25.20	32.21
			50	27.00	33.70

It will be seen at once that not only are all the rates too low, but the older men are not paying in proportion—the usual mistake in assessment insurance plans.

If the R. C. M. P. S. desires to place itself on a perfectly equitable and permanent basis, it should arrange to issue a definite contract, pledging itself to the payment of a fixed amount, and adjust its rates, so that the promise can be carried out and the "last man's" insurance can be paid. As we have often said, there is but one way of doing this, by charging a sufficiently high premium to provide for a regular mathematically correct reserve for every certificate according to age and term of membership, which, plus interest earnings, will reach the face of the certificate at the maximum age of 96 years. This age is certainly high enough to meet any possible objection to the plan on account of laying aside too much money.

The rates to be charged will depend upon the actual mortality of the society, which has at present about 4,000 members, and the rates of interest obtainable for investments. We should think that 4% would be a perfectly safe basis, and if the society can

realize more than that for some time to come, it will benefit the members by making it possible, in the course of time, to accumulate a surplus, which may be used for a reduction of premiums later on.

The present membership can be taken over without examination by charging each the price for age at entry of the old society. In that case it must be ascertained how much of a reserve should have accumulated during time of membership on each certificate, add this amount must be charged against the benefit to be deducted in case of settlement. As these charges form part of the reserve fund [they can be put in shape of notes in connection with the application]; they must be interest bearing at the rate of at least 4%, and the interest should be paid by the member in instalments corresponding to the mode of paying the premiums, say monthly, quarterly, or by the year, as the case may be. Any member desiring to save the interest charges ought to be at liberty to pay off or reduce this loan any time he wishes to do so.

Under this system each certificate represents a certain fixed share of the total assets of the society. While practically held in trust by the society, such reserve really belongs to the certificate holder, it being the result of his overpayments in the earlier years of his membership. For that reason in common equity this reserve should be made available for the member, in case he wishes to withdraw and thus relieve the society of the obligation of paying his certificate in full. That can and should be done by providing in the certificate for the return of such reserve in cash after three or more years of membership, less a surrender charge equivalent to the loss sustained by the society through the withdrawal of a paying member. The amount thus ascertained can also be used as basis of cash loans, thus keeping the member "in the fold," or for paid-up or extended insurance benefits, if preferred.

In that way membership in the society could be made very attractive even for young men, since the payment of the insurance would not only be absolutely secure and the annual cost definitely stated, but also on account of the certificate representing a certain cash saving, which increases from year to year. Under the loan feature a man could use his cash reserve for business purposes without sacrificing the protection of his family, simply decreasing it by the amount he borrowed from the society.

This in short is the best and certainly the only safe way of placing the R. C. M. P. S. or any other assessment life insurance organization on a safe and enduring foundation. It is very gratifying to observe that even such high dignitaries of our Holy Church, like the Archbishop of St. Louis, have recognized the importance

of conducting Catholic fraternal "insurance" on business principles. The average Catholic joins such orders in ignorance of life insurance principles, trusting to the management [and often the well meaning endorsement of the clergy] that the expected benefits will be paid. If a society solicits for membership under such representations without providing for security to meet the obligations, it is practically obtaining money "under false pretenses," and no Catholic institution should lay itself open to such a blame.

The Wittwen und Waisen Fond of the German Catholic Central Society has adopted the plan described herein after years of experimental failures on other lines, and the members of Class B of that institution can now feel sure that their families will not be disappointed by the society in case the bread-winner should die.

38 38 38

MINOR TOPICS.

The Plane of Perfect Consistency.—In every living society there is a certain element of reformers and critics, who make the perfection of that society the object of their special solicitude and, whether in a carping or a kindly spirit, call attention to irregularities and abuses and defects that exist in it. Thus it is in the Church. Ideally, in its essence, in its transcendental entity—in its teachings, its worship, its sacraments and sacramentals, its constitution and laws and counsels—it is "without spot or blemish or any such thing," being the Bride of Christ, the Temple of the Living God, the mystical extension and prolongation of the Incarnation in human society. But empirically, considered in the persons of its individual members, its perfection, at any given time and place, is greater or less, according as its spirit, which is the Holy Spirit of God, vivifies and dominates all its parts. A large proportion of the great saints have displayed their sanctity, particularly in their zeal for reformation, in the good sense of the taking away of all inconsistencies and abuses, all that derogates from the ideal of supernatural life and natural virtue, and all that in any way obscures the face or hampers the action of Divine Truth.

It is the function of a critic to point out the degree of conformity that exists between human acts and works, and the principles or ends by which they should be governed; it is the function of the reformer to bring about such changes as will promote such conformity.

What we have called the Plane of Perfect Consistency is the "happy hunting ground" of the Catholic reformer and critic. And this is no jesting matter, for the truly Catholic critic, in pointing out elements in the customary thought and speech and action and work of Catholics that are inconsistent with sound Catholic philosophy, is performing one of the most necessary and

beneficent of functions, and one that is naturally antecedent to the vitally essential labors of the Catholic reformer.

It is not until one sees all the truths of faith and all the details of Catholic moral and spiritual teaching, worship, organization, law, art and action in their mutual relationships, as one *corpus*—one consistent world-view, unitary, indivisible and sublime, in its necessary and appropriate expression—that the Catholicity of thought potentially possessed by every Catholic begins to be clearly manifested. Such a world-view is the Catholic philosophy, in that highest sense of the word in which it is identical with, or includes, theology as understood by the fathers and the great schoolmen.

There are very few persons, however perfectly they have grasped the Catholic world-view, whose thought is free from elements notably inconsistent with it.—From a paper on "Planes of Catholicity in Thought and Practice in the *Catholic Review of Reviews*, Chicago, vol. iii, No. 4.

Sound Religious Training and University Culture.—Msgr. D. J. O'Connell, Rector of the Catholic University of America, was recently reported as having said, that "the average Catholic man is not as well educated as the average Protestant man." Whereon one of our foremost Catholic American laymen, Mr. James R. Randall, comments in the *Catholic Columbian* (xxix, 16) as follows:

"Well, what of it? If the average Catholic man has sound religious training, he is better off than the average Protestant man, who generally loses at the secular universities whatever orthodox religious belief he ever had. Besides, the average Catholic young man does not need university culture. He may be much better without it, as, in his case, he may resemble some Virginia land described by John Randolph, which 'was poor by nature and ruined by cultivation.' Though some of the professors of the Catholic University have Johns Hopkins diplomas, I take for granted that they emerged from that fiery furnace as did the three Hebrew children from the blaze of Nebuchadnezer. We need a great university which gives the highest mental discipline subordinated to the soundest religious education, and that, we take for granted, will be the object of the Catholic University. The tendency of the higher learning, unless so managed, is to intellectual pride, the spawn of heresy. The old country water-mills produce the best meal and flour, while the patent process up-to-date mills devitalize both cereals. Even Brownson, after years of metaphysical reasoning, found solutions of difficulties in the catechism. So, let the average Catholic man stay in his proper orbit of unshakable faith, without envying any intellectual skeptic, and let the more gifted Catholic man attain all knowledge within his reach with an increase of genuine humility. The late Father Joseph Heidenkamp, S. J., who was learned and a polyglot, but the apostle of the poor, forlorn, outlawed, and even criminal brethren, seeking the salvation of their souls, used to say that 'Many a man would wish himself a jackass at the day of judgment.'"

The "Carmelite Review" and Criminology.—We are asked to print the following communication:

THE REVIEW some weeks ago, lauded the *Carmelite Review*,

mostly on account of its new dress we suppose ; certainly not for its contents. In vol. xii, No. 3, that periodical has a long-winded article, by the Cook County jailer, on the reformation of criminals, offensive both in style and doctrine. Yet the editor, the Rev. Eneas B. Goodwin, finds it worthy of a column and a half of comment, making the Cook County jailer, "one of the greatest practical criminologists living." I will not dispute the good nature and whole-souledness of the Cook County jailer, but emphatically deny his and the editor's statement : "The truth has been seen that crime and disease belong practically to the same category, and that in order to eradicate the sense of criminality from a man, crime must be treated in the same careful way in which a malignant disease is treated. By considering crime as a disease it is immediately brought from the abstract and almost impalpable position that it formerly occupied to a position in which it may be studied as something that is tangible, something that may be examined and investigated and observed in the same way in which some recognized physical ailment and disease is observed."

If the editor knew his catechism, he would not adopt Lombroso's notions of crime and disease ; were he aware that these same notions have been given up by the majority of present-day criminologists, he would not have sanctioned them ; and if he had any regard for the feelings of his readers, he would have corrected the jailer's English.—A Voice from Illinois.

Free Parochial Schools.—Rev. P. Bernard M. Zell, O. S. B., writes to THE REVIEW from Muenster, Cooke County, Texas :

"The congregation at Muenster, Texas, has been blessed with a parochial free school for the last ten years. Four teachers, three Benedictine Sisters and one male lay teacher, are employed, and the expenses of the school are defrayed out of the pew-rent. This is due to the energy and zeal of Rev. P. Bonaventure Binzegger, O. S. B., late pastor of Muenster."

Here is another "kick," for a change:

"In No. 20 of THE REVIEW, I read of 'More Free Parochial Schools.' This card from Ashland, Wis., and like boastings, are getting nauseating to a silent observer. The parishes so far published and set up as models seem to be suffocated by income. Please turn your attention to congregations of 30 to 35 families and give them advice in arranging parochial free schools. The subscriber officiates in a country congregation of 30 families, and supports a school of 60 pupils, in which seven pupils combined pay a monthly school fee of \$1.50 ; the remainder are free. Advice how to better conditions will be gratefully received.—A Silent Observer."

What "Silent Observer" needs is apparently not advice, but credit and encouragement. It is certainly much more difficult, and consequently more meritorious, to support what is practically a free parochial school in a small country, than in a large city parish, even if the latter be not exactly "suffocated by income."

A Protestant View of "Americanism."—The N. Y. *Evening Post* (May 28th) quotes the following significant paragraph from the *Churchman* (Episcopalian) :

"From the first half of the Abbé Houtin's work, ('American-

ism'), which gives a review of the actualities and personalities in American Romanism, it is plainly apparent that the principles advocated and practised by Father Hecker are the natural outgrowth of American conditions. Roman bishops and Roman priests in the United States may not subscribe to Hecker's theories; they will reject the scholastic contortions which Italian ingenuity has foisted upon Hecker's innocent and unsystematic declarations. But the work and progress of the Roman Church in America, the more the nation grows, and the faster it assimilates the foreign elements within its borders, will follow the lines which Hecker's sensitive vision foresaw long before the tendencies of American social developments were clearly manifested. Conservatism will not find a home in American Romanism. It is already a great popular and democratic religious community. When American Romanists begin to think as well as to act, the Latin Church will look back to the times of Jansenius and Febronius as a period of calm and peace."

Endowment Church Insurance.—According to the New York *Independent* (No. 2892) some church congregations provide for an improvement of their financial condition "by the simple means of taking out insurance upon the pastor's life, for the benefit of the church," expecting "that the money will become available just when the need of it is greatest."

We have heard of people taking insurance for the benefit of some religious or charitable institution, or to secure the payment of obligations assumed in case of death before settlement can be effected; in all such cases the policy holders paid the premiums themselves. But the proposition explained by the *Independent* looks very much like, if not exactly "grave-yard insurance," at least speculation in life insurance, hardly in keeping with Christian doctrine.

Imagine the feelings of a pastor heavily insured "for the benefit of his church," in case of serious illness, when he learns of the sympathetic enquiries by members of the congregation regarding his condition? Will he accept such interest as proof of the attachment of his people to their spiritual adviser, or as the expression of a curiosity, how soon the "investment" may be realized?

—In the Syracuse *Catholic Sun* of May 20th we found what purported to be a refutation of recent charges made in THE REVIEW against the order of the "Knights of Columbus." The tone and spirit of this ludicrous "refutation" may be gathered from the fact that the editor of THE REVIEW is therein referred to as "Mr. Buttinski" and is told that he "is 'real mean' to begrudge them" (the K.'s of C.) "the few Masons that were discovered among them" (*sic!*). While we were debating with ourselves the question whether we should say something in reply to this piece of impertinent and hollow criticism, it suddenly bobbed up in the *Dubuque Catholic Tribune* (No. 280) credited to one Scharf, who supplies several Catholic weeklies with regular Washington letters, and followed by this bracketed remark by editor Gonner:

"We regret that Mr. Scharf can not see that *every single answer he makes against the assertions of THE REVIEW simply corroborates*

those assertions. He would have served the cause of the K. of C. better by not publishing this defense, which implicitly concedes the justice of every objection of *THE REVIEW*.—Ed.”

This brief and pointed note by one of the editors who pay Mr. Scharf for his Washington letters, makes further comment on our part unnecessary.

—Under the heading, “A Fighting Bishop” we read in the *Denver Catholic* (v, 31) a report on Msgr. Rooker’s activity in his new Philippine Diocese, Jaro. It winds up as follows :

“The next Sunday found the Bishop and his party going to the church. In the meanwhile Aglipay and his followers had revived and threatened to drive a herd of caribos into the church during the service if the bishop attempted to hold any. But Bishop Rooker was not to be bluffed. He attired himself in full pontificals, taking care to slip a revolver into the sleeve of his white alb. It was an encouraging sight to see the Bishop, in full pontificals, sitting on a temporary throne, a breviary in one hand, a revolver in the other. There was an immense congregation. Some were sulky, but no trouble arose. The Bishop left after installing several priests.”

The Satolli-Ireland maxim of “The Bible in one hand and the Constitution in the other,” is stale, in point of “strenuosity,” when compared with Bishop Rooker’s new recipe of “a breviary in one hand and a revolver in the other.”

—The N. Y. *Evening Journal* (April 20th) quotes from the famous Frenchman, Nicholas Boileau: “This world is full of fools, and he who would not wish to see one must not only shut himself up alone, but must also break his looking-glass.” This is presented as a selection from the “wise words of wise men,” and recommended as worthy of preservation. The quotation is, in substance, a declaration that all men are fools; and as the editor of the *Journal* endorses it, we must assume that he believes it. Otherwise we should be compelled to doubt his honesty. And if he does believe it, the question arises, is he not giving this advice as one of the fools? And we would ask, whether he expects his readers to consider his advice as a piece of folly. If he agrees with Boileau, he must not only think himself a fool, but all his readers as well. How then can he ask his readers to heed his counsel?

—As the outcome of a series of articles on the first Western scholar to penetrate into the terra incognita of Tibet, the Munich *Allgemeine Zeitung* (Beilage No. 30) concludes that this distinction belongs to the German Jesuit Father Grüber. In 1661, at which date he was a missionary in China, P. Grüber went from Peking in company with the Dutch Father Dorville and managed to make the first tour of investigation in Tibet. His report is still considered an excellent production, especially in reference to geography and in its description of the shrines of the country. It is known that Dorville died on the journey, and that Grüber returned to Europe by way of Smyrna. Professor von Richthofen, in his work on China, sketches this journey through Tibet, which, from the starting-point in Peking, covered two hundred and fourteen days.

—We learn from the *Catholic Columbian* (May 29th) that these members of Congress are "Knights of Columbus:" Martin J. Wade of Iowa; John Fitzgerald, Joseph A. Goulden, Ira Edgar Rider, and William H. Ryan of New York; William S. McNary and John A. Sullivan of Massachusetts, and William J. Wynn of California.

We have been assured that all "Knights of Columbus" are zealous Catholics. What have the public men named above ever done to make good this claim?

—The *Civiltà Cattolica* (April 16th), in a description of what is being done for the Italians in the Archdiocese of New York, quotes these words attributed to our Apostolic Delegate on the work of educating the Italian children: "Let us try with all our power to make them good Americans, without ever letting the love of Italy disappear from their hearts."

When this same advice was given by Germans bishops, priests, and editors to their people not many years ago, there was a great outcry. Where are the Americanizers now?

—Pustet & Co. have elicited a declaration from the Secretary of the S. Congregation of Rites, that the Holy Father had not up to April 27th, 1904 (date of the letter), had the reformation of the Roman Breviary under advisement, and that it is not within the knowledge of the S. Congregation if and when he intends to do something in the matter. In the opinion of Pustet & Co., this would seem to put the Breviary reform movement at rest for an indefinite time, at least.

—The *New Century*, of Washington, which Prof. Egan and his friends tried to make a model of "higher Catholic journalism," has been absorbed by Mr. Desmond of the Milwaukee *Catholic Citizen*, who, the *Union and Times* (xxxiii, 8) observes, "seems inclined to become possessed of all the moribund Catholic papers in the country, which he at once proceeds to revivify." Credit to Mr. Desmond; but we don't consider this a healthy symptom.

—Fr. Pustet & Co. announce in a circular to the clergy that their firm will be one of the first to reprint the typical edition of the Plain Chant which is to be issued by the Vatican press, and that they intend to do the work in the same up-to-date style which has made their previous liturgical publications famous.

—Wanted: a good teacher, married man, for a Catholic public school. Eight months term. Salary \$75 per month. Must be good organist. Apply to J. G. Link, Kaskaskia, Ill.

—Bishop Hartley of Columbus epigrammatically says that "the parish without a school is like a home without a mother."—*Catholic Columbian*, xxix, 22.

—Teacher and organist, well-recommended and competent, desires a position. Apply to Rev. J. Wernich, Luxemburg, Minn.

—Work is the salt of life, as, it has been well said, its bread is love, and its water faith.

